

Message

From: Lindstrom, Andrew [Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/28/2016 9:12:55 PM
To: Maguire, Megan [Maguire.Megan@epa.gov]; Strynar, Mark [Strynar.Mark@epa.gov]
CC: Buckley, Timothy [Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov]; Autrey, Brad [Autrey.Brad@epa.gov]; Smith, Emily J. [Smith.Emily@epa.gov]; Hubbard, Carolyn [Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Input from OW and OCSPP regarding responses to The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs
Attachments: A New Fluorinated Surfactant Contaminant in Biota- Perfluorobutane Sulfonamide in Several Fish Species.pdf

Megan,

Would you please specify the text?

I've attached a new paper documenting that some of the newer, shorter formulations are showing up in fish in Canada.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Thank you very much,

Andy

From: Maguire, Megan
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2016 4:02 PM
To: Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>; Strynar, Mark <Strynar.Mark@epa.gov>
Cc: Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Autrey, Brad <Autrey.Brad@epa.gov>; Smith, Emily J. <Smith.Emily@epa.gov>; Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Input from OW and OCSPP regarding responses to The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Hi Mark and Andy

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Sorry this has been going on for so long. Thanks for your help and patience on this!

Megan

Megan Maguire
US EPA, Office of Research and Development
RRB 41261
O: (202)564-6636
C: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Smith, Emily J." <Smith.Emily@epa.gov>
Date: January 26, 2016 at 9:58:42 AM EST
To: "Maguire, Megan" <Maguire.Megan@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Input from OW and OCSPP regarding responses to The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

FYI-

Emily J. Smith
Communications Director
EPA National Exposure Research Laboratory
109 T.W. Alexander Drive

MD-305-01
Research Triangle Park, NC, 27711
Phone: 919-541-5556
E-mail: smith.emily@epa.gov

From: Smith, Emily J.

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2016 9:58 AM

To: Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>; Strynar, Mark <strynar.mark@epa.gov>

Cc: Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Medina-Vera, Myriam <Medina-Vera.Myriam@epa.gov>; Biales, Adam <Biales.Adam@epa.gov>; Autrey, Brad <Autrey.Brad@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Input from OW and OCSPP regarding responses to The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Thanks Andy. I don't need anything more from you or Mark, right now, but I'll definitely let you know when I hear back.

Just an FYI that the EPA office in DC was closed Friday and Monday, and it is also closed today, due to the snowstorm. The EPA press officer has been working on media requests from home on her iphone, including this request. Yesterday, she reviewed the edits that you and Mark provided just before the snowstorm. She's fine with them, is now passing them back to OW and OCSPP for their review. Since the DC office is closed, I don't know whether these folks will be working from home today. So, it's possible that we may not hear back on this til tomorrow – or whenever the DC office opens again.

Feel free to email or call if you have questions. Thanks again for your responsiveness with this!

-Emily

Emily J. Smith
Communications Director
EPA National Exposure Research Laboratory
109 T.W. Alexander Drive
MD-305-01
Research Triangle Park, NC, 27711
Phone: 919-541-5556
E-mail: smith.emily@epa.gov

From: Lindstrom, Andrew

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2016 9:00 AM

To: Smith, Emily J. <Smith.Emily@epa.gov>; Strynar, Mark <Strynar.Mark@epa.gov>

Cc: Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Medina-Vera, Myriam <Medina-Vera.Myriam@epa.gov>; Biales, Adam <Biales.Adam@epa.gov>; Autrey, Brad <Autrey.Brad@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Input from OW and OCSPP regarding responses to The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Emily,

Thank you very much for summarizing our comments and reflecting them in the response to the press office.

With all the confusion and delay associated with the blizzard, I am not sure where this all stands right now. Please let us know if there is anything we need to do to finalize our response.

Thank you for your help!

Andy

From: Smith, Emily J.

Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 4:20 PM

To: Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>; Strynar, Mark <Strynar.Mark@epa.gov>

Cc: Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Medina-Vera, Myriam <Medina-Vera.Myriam@epa.gov>; Biales, Adam <Biales.Adam@epa.gov>; Autrey, Brad <Autrey.Brad@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Input from OW and OCSPP regarding responses to The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Andy and Mark – Thanks for meeting with me about this. I've summarized our feedback below, and have drafted an email to Megan Maguire in the ORD Communications Office who will be communicating to OW, OCSPP and the EPA press office about this. Let me know if I've captured our discussion correctly. I'd like to send this up by COB today. Thank you!

-Emily

Megan,

NERL scientists Andy Lindstrom and Mark Strynar have reviewed the feedback from OCSPP and OW, and are fine with most of the changes. However, they do have some changes that they would like made. I have noted them in red text below. We are assuming that the responses for which OCSPP and OW did not provide edits, will be forwarded to the reporter as is. Is that correct?

When passing the written responses onto the reporter, please say that they were developed by Andy Lindstrom, Ph.D. and Mark Strynar, Ph.D., research physical scientists in EPA's National Exposure Research Laboratory. There are two places that I've noted in red below where it is important for the EPA press office to clarify that the information is coming from OW or OCSPP (and not from Dr. Lindstrom or Dr. Strynar).

Let me know if you have questions.

Thanks!

-Emily

Emily J. Smith
Communications Director
EPA National Exposure Research Laboratory
109 T.W. Alexander Drive
MD-305-01
Research Triangle Park, NC, 27711
Phone: 919-541-5556
E-mail: smith.emily@epa.gov

From: Maguire, Megan

Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 4:29 PM

To: Smith, Emily J. <Smith.Emily@epa.gov>

Cc: Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>; Linkins, Samantha <Linkins.Samantha@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: MARY/LINDA ACTION; DDL COB TUESDAY 1/19: The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Edits from OCSPP

We are fine with the revision in green. We suggest the following two changes below. As background for you guys, I am also providing a blurb on our efforts on reviewing perfluoro alternatives that have come in through the TSCA New Chem program.

What research questions does this paper raise?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-Do they bear notable similarities to other chemicals?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Background blurb on possible alternatives: If the press office decides to share this background blurb with the reporter, our scientists would like the press office to clarify that it comes from OCSPP, and not from the scientists themselves.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Edits from OW

-How can this research be useful (i.e. how can scientists benefit from this information)?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

On Jan 14, 2016, at 3:52 PM, Maguire, Megan <Maguire.Megan@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Robert- I got answers in to the first round of questions before I could add the additional questions. They responded saying they could send answers on Wednesday by noon if that works. Because of the long weekend there isn't time to answer all of them in writing before then.

This is to OPA from the scientists: --Thank you to the OPA for pointing out the NY Times article. We have been following this situation and have been fully aware of most of the developments in this case. The article about Robert Bilott is an exceptional piece of journalism that summarizes much of what has happened in the past 30 years of PFAS production. --

We hope that the following answers help describe the major points covered in our recent paper. This is a very complicated combination of subjects (mass spectrometry and perfluorinated compound chemistry) so we expect that it may be necessary to respond to some follow-up questions from this reporter. We believe that a telephone interview would be the fastest and most accurate way to respond to any additional questions.

And here are their answers:

-Where did they find these chemicals?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-How they knew to look for the chemicals where they did?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-How exactly did they get the water samples? (i.e. a description of their process)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-Once they got samples, how did they figure out which chemicals were in the water?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-How can this research can be useful (i.e. how can scientists benefit from this information)?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-What research questions does this paper raise?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-What is known about the chemicals you found?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-Do they bear notable similarities to other chemicals?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

-Are there any presentations I might see, powerpoints or something, else that summarize their process or findings?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Do they have CBI clearance? Why or why not?"

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Megan Maguire
US EPA, Office of Research and Development
RRB 41261
O: (202)564-6636

C [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

From: Daguillard, Robert
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2016 12:24 PM
To: Maguire, Megan <Maguire.Megan@epa.gov>; Perry, Dale <Perry.Dale@epa.gov>; Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Cc: Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Linkins, Samantha <Linkins.Samantha@epa.gov>
Subject: MEGAN ACTION: DDL 1/15 (tentative); The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Megan, here are additional questions from Sharon. If a response by tomorrow is not feasible (which I understand it may not be, at this stage), let me know and I'll tell the reporter.

Thanks, R.

- > Hi Robert-
- > As promised, here are my additional questions:
- > How many water samples did they take?
- > Over what period of time?
- > From what locations exactly?
- > How exactly did they get them (i.e. -using a boat, walking directly to the shore, etc)
- > If it was a boat, can they please describe it?
- > What sort of equipment did they use to analyze the samples?
- > How many hours would they estimate they spent analyzing the samples and doing other work for the paper?

1) In their paper (page E) they say there were "77 features that were unique to the downstream sample." Does that mean there were 77 chemicals that were not in the upstream sample and were in the downstream sample? If not, can they please clarify.

2) What is known about the relative stability of these PFCs (whose carbon chains are separated by oxygen atoms) to for instance PFOA? What do we know about how much less stable - and thus less persistent - they are?

Robert Daguillard
Office of Media Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)
+1 [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] cel)

<image001.png>

From: Maguire, Megan
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 2:23 PM
To: Perry, Dale <Perry.Dale@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Cc: Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Linkins, Samantha <Linkins.Samantha@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: CAROLYN AWARENESS: DDL 1/15 (tentative); The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Thanks, we just asked if they could have written responses by Friday, we will let you know when we hear back.

Thanks,
Megan

Megan Maguire
US EPA, Office of Research and Development
RRB 41261
O: (202)564-6636
C: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: Perry, Dale
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 1:56 PM
To: Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Cc: Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Maguire, Megan <Maguire.Megan@epa.gov>; Linkins, Samantha <Linkins.Samantha@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: CAROLYN AWARENESS: DDL 1/15 (tentative); The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

+ Megan and Sam

Dale H. Perry, Ph.D.
Science Advisor to the Office of Public Affairs
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Mail Code 1701A
Washington, D.C., 20460
Office: 202-564-7338
Cell: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: Daguillard, Robert
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 1:51 PM
To: Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Cc: Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Perry, Dale <Perry.Dale@epa.gov>
Subject: CAROLYN AWARENESS: DDL 1/15 (tentative); The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Carolyn, a quick word to let you know we've discussed this inquiry with Dale. We'll be asking ORD to craft written responses to this inquiry. Please let us know if we can meet the reporter's Friday 1/15 deadline.

We expect the reporter will almost certainly come back to us with follow-up questions of a more regulatory nature -- that we would obviously send to other program offices.

Thanks in advance. Please drop me and Cathy a line if you want to discuss.

Best, R.

Robert Daguiard
Office of Media Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)
+1 (202) 564-6618 (cel)
<image001.png>

From: Maguire, Megan

Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 12:29 PM

To: Perry, Dale <Perry.Dale@epa.gov>; Daguiard, Robert <Daguiard.Robert@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>; Linkins, Samantha <Linkins.Samantha@epa.gov>

Cc: Lee, Monica <Lee.Monica@epa.gov>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OW/OCSP AWARENESS: DDL 1/15 (tentative); The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Adding Sam. Robert/Cathy- the link to the full paper is on the page that is mentioned below, it's in the upper right corner under full text links, but here is the direct link if that's easier:

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.5b01215>

Thanks,
Megan

Megan Maguire
US EPA, Office of Research and Development
RRB 41261
O: (202)564-6636
C: (202)564-6618 (cel)

From: Perry, Dale

Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 12:08 PM

To: Daguiard, Robert <Daguiard.Robert@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Maguire, Megan <Maguire.Megan@epa.gov>; Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>

Cc: Lee, Monica <Lee.Monica@epa.gov>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OW/OCSP AWARENESS: DDL 1/15 (tentative); The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Plus Carolyn and Megan for their awareness as well

Dale H. Perry, Ph.D.
Science Advisor to the Office of Public Affairs
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Mail Code 1701A
Washington, D.C., 20460
Office: 202-564-7338
Cell: (202)564-7338 (cel)

From: Daguiard, Robert

Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 12:06 PM

To: Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>

Cc: Lee, Monica <Lee.Monica@epa.gov>; Perry, Dale <Perry.Dale@epa.gov>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>

Subject: OW/OCSP AWARENESS: DDL 1/15 (tentative); The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Colleagues, a quick heads-up that Sharon Lerner of The Intercept would like to interview two ORD scientists who recently authored a paper on PFECs in North Carolina waterways. Dale Perry is aware of the inquiry and has flagged this New York Times Magazine story.

I've summarized my conversation with Sharon on Friday and forwarded her questions. No specific questions yet for your programs. Again, this is strictly a heads-up.

Robert Daguiard
Office of Media Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)
+1 [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)] (el)
<image001.png>

From: Perry, Dale
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 2:04 PM
To: Daguiard, Robert <Daguiard.Robert@epa.gov>
Cc: Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: DALE ACTION: DDL 1/15 (tentative); The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Ok....I'll take a look and read the article.

For your awareness I'm also flagging this NY Times story for you. It was actually sent to me by one of my colleagues with EPA's Environmental Response Team in Edison NJ. I worked with him on this site in Parkersburg, WV, met Mr Tennant and worked on the ecological risk assessment for the Dry Run landfill while I was a contractor for EPA back in the day.

http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/10/magazine/the-lawyer-who-became-duponts-worst-nightmare.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=photo-spot-region®ion=top-news&WT.nav=top-news&_r=1

Dale H. Perry, Ph.D.
Science Advisor to the Office of Public Affairs
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Mail Code 1701A
Washington, D.C., 20460
Office: 202-564-7338
Cell: [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

From: Daguiard, Robert
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 1:59 PM
To: Perry, Dale <Perry.Dale@epa.gov>
Cc: Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Subject: DALE ACTION: DDL 1/15 (tentative); The Intercept (Sharon Lerner); PFECs

Dale, touching base about this Sharon Lerner interview request for The Intercept.

Her story is not, strictly speaking, a follow-up on the series she did this summer on PFOAs in water in West Virginia. However, the areas where Mark and Andrew conducted their research is apparently located downstream from a plant owned by DuPont, or its successor company.

Essentially, she tells me she's looking at chemicals that have replaced phased-out substances.

She also she may look at the degree to which information from companies using chemicals is disseminated within EPA. In other words, do enough people at EPA know about a company's plans with regards to chemicals use. Hence the question about CBI at the end of the inquiry.

I'll call you in a bit to discuss. Maybe you and Cathy can chime in on whether this deserves an interview. I haven't promised her anything. She'd like a response in a little as a week, but she's willing to wait a little.

"Here are some of the questions I hope to ask Mark Strynar and Andrew Lindstrom:

I'm interested in how they did the research for this paper, so I'd like to ask:

- Where did they find these chemicals?
- How they knew to look for the chemicals where they did?
- How exactly did they get the water samples? (i.e. a description of their process)
- Once they got samples, how did they figure out which chemicals were in the water?

Also, I'm interested in what they see as the significance of this paper, so:

- How can this research can be useful (i.e. how can scientists benefit from this information)?
- What research questions does this paper raise?
- What is known about the chemicals you found?
- Do they bear notable similarities to other chemicals?

-Are there any presentations I might see, powerpoints or something, else that summarize their process or findings?

Do they have CBI clearance? Why or why not?

Thanks and have a nice weekend,"

Robert Daguillard
Office of Media Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)
+1 Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) (el)
<image001.png>

<Nakayama et al. 2007.pdf>

<Wang et al., 2013.pdf>

<The Madrid Statement on Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs).pdf>

<Heydebreck et al., 2015 New and legacy PFAS in Europe and China.pdf>

<USEPA (NERLRTP) sample collection and analysis protocols for perfluorina....pdf>

<Lindstrom SETAC 2014 .pdf>

<Strynar SETAC water 11-4-14.pdf>